

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. No claims have been canceled. Claim 9 has been added. Claim 1-8 have been amended to more properly define preexisting claim limitations and are supported by the specification.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,914,633 of Comino et al. (“Comino”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 as amended sets forth feeding back the logic voltage at the corresponding output pad to a comparator. In contrast, the tuning circuit in Comino does not feed back the logic voltage at an output pad to a comparator. To the contrary, Comino explicitly discloses that the tuning circuit is not based on feedback, making the design straightforward (Comino, col. 2, ln. 42-43). Therefore, Comino fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Furthermore, claim 1 sets forth comparing the logic voltage at the corresponding output pad with a reference voltage. In contrast, Comino fails to disclose the above limitation. The Examiner argued that units 30, 32, and 36 in Figure 2A and the related description discloses the above limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. According to Comino, unit 30 is configured as an integrator to integrate a reference voltage (VREF 50) and a multiple of VREF 50, kREF 52. The comparator 34 compares another multiple of VREF 50, i.e., nVREF 56, with the integrator output 60. The comparator 32 compares another multiple of VREF 50, i.e., mVREF 54, with the integrator output 60. (Comino, Figure 2A; col. 3, ln. 64 – col. 5, ln. 2). The units 30, 32, and 36 do not compare a logic voltage at an output pad with a reference voltage.

Therefore, Comino fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 6 as amended is not anticipated by Comino. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 6, respectively. Hence, claims 2-5 and 7-8 are not anticipated by Comino for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

New claim 9 depends indirectly from claim 1, and thus, is not anticipated by Comino for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,042

Date: January 11, 2005

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300